

REMARKS

Claims 1-43 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. Claim 17 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of the present amendments, Claims 1-43 are pending in this application, of which Claims 1, 17 and 29 are independent. Applicant submits that pending Claims 1-43 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections and urges the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 17-21 and 25-28 Rejected as Anticipated by Eaton

Claims 17-21 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0101343 to Eaton (“Eaton”). Amended Claim 17 is an independent claim. Claims 18-21 and 25-28 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent Claim 17, as amended. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that Eaton fails to disclose each and every limitation of the claimed invention.

A. Independent Claim 17 Patentably Distinguished Over Eaton

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. Amended independent Claim 17 is directed towards a method for providing remote access to a plurality of application sessions. Claim 17 recites “providing to the user, a menu option for selecting one of a plurality of

disconnected application sessions.” Applicant submits that Eaton fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Eaton does not disclose providing the user a menu option to select one of a plurality of disconnected application sessions. Instead, Eaton discusses using software that does not provide the user with a menu option to select one of a plurality of disconnected application sessions. Eaton merely mentions using software to interface with a messaging communication system, and does not describe using software to display a menu option to the user. (See Eaton, par. [0026], [0071] and [0098]) Therefore, Eaton does not disclose “providing to the user, a menu option for selecting one of a plurality of disconnected application sessions.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Eaton fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 17, therefore, Claim 17 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 18-21 and 25-28 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent Claim 17, as amended. Therefore, Applicant submits that dependent claims 18-21 and 25-28 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 17-21 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-16, 22-24 and 29-43 rejected over Eaton and Knouse

Claims 1-16, 22-24 and 29-43 are rejected as unpatentable over Eaton in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0101343A1 to Knouse et al. (“Knouse”) and in further view of WO 02/37267 to Wall et al. (“Wall”) under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claims 1, 17 and 29 are independent claims. Claims 2-16 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent Claim 1. Claims 22-24 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject

matter of independent Claim 17, as amended. Claims 30-43 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent Claim 29. Applicant traverses this rejection and respectfully submits that Eaton, Knouse and Wall, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Independent Claims 1 and 29 Patentable over Eaton, Knouse and Wall

To establish obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Independent claims 1 and 29 are directed to a method and a server for providing remote access to a plurality of disconnected application sessions. These claims recite determining via a rule that the user is one of required, permitted or forbidden to connect to a first disconnected application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions. Applicant submits that Eaton, Knouse and Wall, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Eaton, Knouse and Wall, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest determining via a rule that a user is one of required, forbidden or permitted to connect to a first disconnected application session of a plurality of disconnected application sessions. The Examiner admits that Eaton does not teach or suggest this claim limitation. Knouse and Wall, however, also do not teach or suggest this claim limitation. Knouse does not discuss determining that a user is required, forbidden or permitted to connect, but rather discusses granting a user a success or a failure to connect to a server via authentication and authorization rules, without ever requiring the user to connect. (See Knouse par. [0157], [0158] and [0165]). Therefore, Knouse presents a user with only two options: to connect or not to connect. Knouse does not present the user with three options, *i.e.* to require, forbid or permit the user to connect to a disconnected application session. Furthermore, Knouse does not connect the user to a disconnected application session,

but rather connects the user to a server via an entirely new session established using authentication and authorization rules, and a cookie.

Wall also fails to teach or suggest determining, via a rule, that a user is required, forbidden or permitted to connect to a disconnected application session. Instead, Wall uses authorization rules to determine if a user can or cannot access resources on a server via application sessions which have already been established. Wall's authorization does not control the requiring, forbidding or permitting of a connection to a disconnected application session, but rather controls the requiring, forbidding or permitting of access to resources on a server via an application session that has already been established. One of ordinary skill in the art knows that access to resources cannot be allowed before the session has been re-established. Thus, the rule of the claimed invention, determining if the user re-establishes a disconnected application session of the user, is an action occurring before the user can access any resources via the newly re-established application session. This aspect of the claimed invention contrasts with Wall's rule that determines if the user accesses resources after the application session has already been established.¹

Eaton, Knouse and Wall, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest determining via a rule that a user is one of required, forbidden or permitted to connect to a first disconnected application session of a plurality of disconnected application sessions. Applicant, therefore, submits that independent Claims 1 and 29 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-16 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent Claim 1. Claims, 22-24 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent

¹ In the claimed invention, for example, the user may be required to connect to a certain disconnected application session, but then may be forbidden to connect to another disconnected application session. Wall does not describe whether a user may be required to reconnect,

Claim 17, as amended. Claims 30-43 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent Claim 29. Thus, Applicant submits dependent claims 2-16, 22-24 and 30-43 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of independent claims 1-16, 22-24 and 29-43 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicant contends that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's agent would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicant's agent at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: September 29, 2008

/ Kellan D. Ponikiewicz/

Kellan D. Ponikiewicz

Registration No. 59,701

Agent for Applicant

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP

Two International Place

Boston, MA 02110

(617) 248-5000

forbidden to reconnect or permitted to reconnect to a system in which the user has multiple disconnected application sessions.